UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,321	05/23/2007	Pier John Anthony Sazio	DYOUP0312US	7462
23908 7590 01/27/2010 RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115			EXAMINER	
			GEYER, SCOTT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2812	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/595,321	SAZIO ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Scott B. Geyer	2812		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 D This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40-43 is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2009 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	vn from consideration. r election requirement. er. ure: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected or abjected or bolonics. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected or bolonics.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
	ammor. Note the attached embe	71011011 01 1011111 1 0 102.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Ex Parte Quayle Action

Acknowledgement is made of applicant's response to the previous office action. However, prosecution has been re-opened. The updated drawings submitted on December 18, 2009 are acceptable.

Information Disclosure Statement

The applicant is hereby reminded of 37 CFR 1.56, the duty to disclose information material to patentability. Although the applicant included two IDS documents with the instant application, the inventors co-pending application (10/595,323) was not cited, and at least the first 5 claims in both of these applications are currently identical.

Double Patenting

At least claims 1-5 of this application conflict with claims 1-5 of Application No. 10/595,323. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either

Art Unit: 2812

cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

//

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/595,323. This is a <u>provisional</u> double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

//

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 6-39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6-54 of copending Application No. 10/595,323. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations recited in the claims of the instant application are all recited in the claims of the '323 application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott B. Geyer whose telephone number is (571)272-1958. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays, between 9:30am and 4:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles D. Garber can be reached on (571)272-2194. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,321 Page 5

Art Unit: 2812

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott B Geyer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2812